

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
MEDICAL SCHOOL  
DEPARTMENT OF MICROBIOLOGY AND IMMUNOLOGY

**7.12 STATEMENT**

Statements Required By Section 7.12 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*

**PART 1. MEDICAL SCHOOL PREAMBLE**

**I. INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT**

This document describes the specific criteria and standards which will be used to evaluate whether candidates from the Medical School meet the general criteria for tenure in Section 7.11 and for promotion to professor in Section 9.2 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*. All candidates for promotion and/or tenure in the Medical School are evaluated with the criteria and standards in this preamble. In addition, each department in the Medical School has its own 7.12 Statement (Part II of this document) that further delineates the criteria for promotion and/or tenure within that individual unit. For a complete perspective, the reader is advised to review Sections 7 and 9 in their entirety. Section 7.11 is printed in IV: Criteria for Tenure (see below); Section 9.2 is printed in V.C Promotion to Professor. This preamble contains Criteria and Standards pertaining to:

- A. Appointment
- B. Awarding of indefinite tenure
- C. Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor and from Associate Professor to Professor
- D. The process for the annual appraisal of probationary and tenured faculty

The criteria, standards, and procedures are applied without regard to race, religion, color, sex, national origin, handicap, age, veteran status or sexual orientation.

The Medical School issues annually to each department, for distribution and information to faculty members, a set of instructions, memoranda, and other documents, giving detailed information on the procedures to be followed in the preparation and consideration of each proposal for tenure and/or promotion in rank. The pertinent documents are identified as exhibits enclosed with a cover memorandum from the Dean.

The Medical School 7.12 and Departmental 7.12 Statements are reviewed and approved by the dean of the Medical School and the senior vice president for academic affairs and provost.

The relevant University documents regarding criteria for tenure and/or promotion and the procedures for implementing these criteria are:

- University of Minnesota Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*
- *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure Track and Tenured Faculty*

**II. MISSION STATEMENT**

Committed to innovation and diversity, the Medical School educates physicians, scientists, and health professionals; generates knowledge and treatments; and cares for patients and communities with compassion and respect.

The Medical School strongly encourages and values interdisciplinary work, including scholarship, public engagement, and teaching, as well as interprofessional collaboration in clinical sciences. Concordant with

the position of the National Institutes of Health, the Medical School values Co-Principal Investigators and interdisciplinary collaboration on major funding proposals as well.

### III. APPOINTMENT AND ANNUAL APPRAISALS OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY

#### A. APPOINTMENT

##### 1. Assistant Professor

In the Medical School the entry level rank for faculty is at the Assistant Professor level.

The minimal, general criteria for initial appointment at this rank include:

- a. Possession of a terminal degree (MD or equivalent, or Ph.D.)
- b. Board eligibility or certification (if applicable - clinical specialties)
- c. Demonstrated ability in teaching
- d. Demonstrated involvement in high-quality research which has been accepted for publication or is published in peer-reviewed national or international journals
- e. Documentation of competence in the skills of communication, including effective communication in teaching students and in oral and written presentations of research

Each department may add specialty-specific criteria for appointment, in their Departmental 7.12 Statement.

##### 2. Associate Professor and Professor

- a. The criteria and standards for appointment at the rank of Associate Professor are those stated for awarding of tenure.
- b. The criteria and standards for appointment at the rank of Professor are those stated for promotion to this rank.

In addition, for clinically active faculty, it is expected that for appointment at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor they will have achieved appropriate Board Certification in the specific field where they are practicing.

##### 3. Secondary Appointments

The appointment home for a faculty member is always in the primary department (the tenure home is the University of Minnesota). Joint and/or secondary appointment requests will be made by the secondary department with the support of the primary department in the form of a request letter(s) signed by both department heads, addressed to the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs in the Medical School. In the case that the appointment being requested is at the Associate Professor or Professor level, the secondary department may conduct a faculty vote by written ballot, based on the proposed collaborative activity in the secondary department for the faculty member. The results of the vote should be reported at the time of the request for appointment.

#### B. ANNUAL APPRAISALS OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY

In fulfillment of Sections 7.11 and 7.12 and in accord with Section 7.2 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*; “the tenured faculty of each academic unit annually reviews the progress of each probationary faculty member toward satisfaction of the criteria for receiving tenure. The head of the unit prepares a written summary of that review and discusses the candidate’s progress with the candidate, giving a copy of the report to the candidate.”

All tenure-track faculty will undergo an annual review each academic year. An academic year is defined in Section 5.3 in the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*. Annual appraisals in the Medical School and its departments comply with the procedures described in *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty*. Each department will outline the specific process and criteria for annual appraisals, but at the very least

will include a review by the tenured faculty of the department and an annual conference with the Department Head. These procedures are provided for by Sections 16.3, 7.4, and 7.61 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*.

The annual review of probationary faculty will be recorded on the *University of Minnesota (UM) Form 12* and will reflect the faculty member's performance relative to the 7.12 Statement. A record of the vote by the tenured faculty for continuation or recommendation for promotion and/or tenure will be included on the *UM Form 12*, if a vote was taken. (This vote on annual reviews is optional). Each department will determine, and so state in their departmental 7.12 Statement, whether or not such a vote will be taken. If such an annual vote is taken in any department, a 2/3 majority of eligible voting faculty is required for continuation of the probationary appointment. A motion for termination also requires a 2/3 majority of eligible voting faculty for action to be taken. A record of the vote, either for continuation or termination, must be included on the *UM Form 12*. If a faculty member has extended his or her probationary period according to Section 5.5 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*, this must be noted on the *UM Form 12* during the annual review.

The department head will meet annually with each probationary faculty member to review his/her completed *UM Form 12*. The department head and faculty member will sign the completed *President's Form 12*. The *UM Form 12* is forwarded to the dean for review, comment, and signoff.

The *UM Form 12* is then forwarded to the senior vice president for academic affairs and provost (SVPP) for review, comment, and signoff. A copy is kept in the SVPP Office. The signed *UM Form 12* will be kept in the probationary faculty member's tenure file and will become a part of the dossier.

For faculty members with joint and/or secondary appointments in another Medical School or University Department, annual reviews will be carried out according to the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty*. For a candidate who has an appointment in more than one unit, the candidate's offer letter will specify how the candidate will be evaluated annually and at the time of the tenure and/or promotion decision, including which unit's 7.12 statement will be used as the basis for evaluation and which unit's votes of tenured faculty will be counted or reported for the second level of review in the Medical School. The primary unit will receive input from the secondary unit on performance of responsibilities specific to that unit prior to each annual review and decision on promotion and tenure.

#### IV. CRITERIA FOR TENURE

Section 7.11 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure* states:

**7.11 General Criteria.** *What the University of Minnesota seeks above all in its faculty members is intellectual distinction and academic integrity. The basis for awarding indefinite tenure to the candidates possessing these qualities is the determination that each has established and is likely to continue to develop a distinguished record of academic achievement that is the foundation for a national or international reputation or both [FN 2]. This determination is reached through a qualitative evaluation of the candidate's record of scholarly research or other creative work, teaching, and service [FN 3]. The relative importance of these criteria may vary in different academic units, but each of the criteria must be considered in every decision [FN 4]. Demonstrated scholarly or other creative achievement and teaching effectiveness must be given primary emphasis; service alone cannot qualify the candidate for tenure. Interdisciplinary work, public engagement, international activities and initiatives, attention to questions of diversity, technology*

*transfer, and other special kinds of professional activity by the candidate should be considered when applicable. The awarding of indefinite tenure presupposes that the candidate's record shows strong promise of his or her achieving promotion to professor.*

*[FN 2] "Academic achievement" includes teaching as well as scholarly research and other creative work. The definition and relative weight of the factors may vary with the mission of the individual campus.*

*[FN 3] The persons responsible and the process for making this determination are described in subsections 7.3 through 7.6.*

*"Scholarly research" must include significant publications and, as appropriate, the development and dissemination by other means of new knowledge, technology, or scientific procedures resulting in innovative products, practices, and ideas of significance and value to society.*

*"Other creative work" refers to all forms of creative production across a wide range of disciplines, including, but not limited to, visual and performing arts, design, architecture of structures and environments, writing, media, and other modes of expression.*

*"Teaching" is not limited to classroom instruction. It includes extension and outreach education, and other forms of communicating knowledge to both registered University students and persons in the extended community, as well as supervising, mentoring, and advising students.*

*"Service" may be professional or institutional. Professional service, based on one's academic expertise, is that provided to the profession, to the University, or to the local, state, national, or international community. Institutional service may be administrative, committee, and related contributions to one's department or college, or the University. All faculty members are expected to engage in service activities, but only modest institutional service should be expected of probationary faculty.*

*[FN 4] Indefinite tenure may be granted at any time the candidate has satisfied the requirements. A probationary appointment must be terminated when the appointee fails to satisfy the criteria in the last year of probationary service and may be terminated earlier if the appointee is not making satisfactory progress within that period toward meeting the criteria.*

A recommendation for tenure is made when an eligible faculty member has fulfilled the General Criteria for tenure, as stated in Section 7.11, and the standards stated by the Medical School and the department. Candidates must be evaluated for tenure during their mandatory decision year at the latest. The mandatory decision year occurs during the sixth probationary year for tenure-track faculty in the basic science departments, and in the ninth year for tenure-track faculty in clinical departments.

When distinction in research has greater weight in the decision to award tenure, the candidate must also show, at a minimum, evidence of competence in teaching. When distinction in teaching has the greater weight in the decision to award tenure, the candidate must also show, at a minimum, evidence of competence in research. Distinction in research requires documented evidence of high-level, independent scholarly effort. Distinction in teaching requires documented evidence of innovation and effectiveness in teaching, which have attracted national recognition.

Probationary faculty can extend their maximum period of probationary service, by one year for each occurrence of circumstances as described in Section 5.5 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*. In the case of childbirth, adoption, or foster placement of a child, a probationary faculty member must notify the department head, the dean of the Medical School and the senior vice president for academic affairs and provost of this circumstance using University of Minnesota Form UM 1764 and the extension of the probationary period is automatic. In the case of caregiver responsibilities or personal illness or injury, the probationary faculty member must receive the approval of the senior vice president for academic affairs and provost using University of Minnesota Form UM 1765. No probationary period may

be extended for more than three years. (See the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty* for more details.)

#### A. TEACHING

Distinction in teaching for the granting of tenure must include scholarly work in education. Evidence of the generation of new methods of pedagogy with national recognition by peers (AAMC, ACE) and impact on educational programs nationally is required. Activities may occur in a variety of educational settings and formats, including: didactic presentations, lectures, seminars, conferences, tutorials, laboratories, case discussions, grand rounds, hospital and clinic rounds, patient care, surgical and other procedures, and continuing education. Competence in teaching requires participation in appropriate courses with satisfactory learner evaluations.

Assessment of distinction in teaching and advising students is based upon:

1. Innovative contributions to the field of medical education which have been adopted for use by other institutions and are recognized by peers as scholarly contributions.
2. Review of course(s) taught, directed, or developed; a list of students and degree candidates for whom the faculty member has served as academic adviser.
3. Evidence of teaching excellence at the undergraduate, graduate, and/or post-doctoral levels, evaluated by the written statements and/or compiled ratings of students.
4. Written statements by the Head of the Department, academic peers, and others familiar with the candidate's performance in teaching and educational scholarship.
5. Accumulation of above forms of evidence on teaching competence and excellence over a sustained period of time.

Assessment of competence in teaching is based upon:

1. Learner and/or peer evaluations.

#### B. RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP

Assessment of distinction in research is based upon the following:

1. A review of the candidate's scientific publications, particularly those in national or international peer-reviewed journals. Evidence is sought that the work is scholarly, creative, and of high quality and significance, whether focused on laboratory endeavors, clinical investigations, or analysis or synthesis of clinical observations and experience.
2. Independence of research accomplishments or significant contribution to interdisciplinary or collaborative research. Evidence of independence or significant contribution to interdisciplinary or collaborative research may include:
  - a. Naming of the candidate as the first or senior author on multi-authored journal articles and/or documentation of major, substantial contributions by the candidate to the collaborative project and publication.
  - b. Statements of peer evaluators on the creativity and significance of the candidate's contributions to a collaborative research project and/or to multi-authored publications.
  - c. Identification of the candidate as the principal investigator or a major collaborator on peer-reviewed, funded research grants or contracts
  - d. Invitations/nominations to serve on study sections, national policy boards, editorial boards, etc.
3. External research funding from federal and other national granting agencies which sponsor programs in biomedical and other scientific research subject to peer review.
4. Significant original contributions based on clinical observations resulting in new therapies or techniques which impact the practice of medicine.

Assessment of competence in research is based upon:

1. Evidence of significant discipline-related publications, including reports of clinical investigations, identification through case reports of new syndromes or treatments, and descriptions of new techniques.
2. Participation in invited scientific and clinical symposia, meetings and lectures.
3. Letters from authorities in the candidate's clinical discipline assessing his/her contributions to the discipline.

C. CLINICAL SERVICE (if applicable)

Clinical Service expectations in decisions for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor include enjoying an excellent reputation inside and outside the Twin Cities area as an authority in a clinical specialty, as demonstrated by patient referrals from outside the area, invited visiting lectureships, and memberships in professional societies.

D. SERVICE

In the Medical School service contributions are an integral part of the academic unit. Such service can be used to demonstrate an additional area of strength for the recommendation of tenure.

Examples of service contributions include:

1. Participation in discipline-specific regional and national organizations.
2. Service to the Department, School, or University on governance-related or policy making committees.
3. Service to the community, State, and public engagement.

**V. CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR PROMOTION IN FACULTY RANK**

A. ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

In the Medical School, the entry level rank for faculty is at the Assistant Professor level. It is therefore anticipated that there will be no promotions to this rank.

B. TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

The general criteria and standards for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor are those stated for consideration of tenure (see IV above).

In addition, for clinically active faculty, it is expected that they will have achieved appropriate Board Certification in the specific field where they are practicing.

A recommendation for promotion to Associate Professor is made when an eligible faculty member has fulfilled the general criteria applicable to tenure, as stated in Section 7.11, and the specific criteria and standards for promotion to Associate Professor as stated by the Medical School and the Department. It is also an expectation of the University and the Medical School that all faculty promoted to associate professor with tenure are on a trajectory that will result in them achieving the rank of full Professor.

C. TO PROFESSOR

A recommendation for promotion to Professor is based on criteria set by the Medical School and the Department in accord with Section 9.2 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*

***9.2 Criteria for Promotion to Professor.*** *The basis for promotion to the rank of professor is the determination that each candidate has (1) demonstrated the intellectual distinction and academic integrity expected of all faculty members, (2) added substantially to an already distinguished record of academic achievement, and (3) established the national or international reputation (or both) ordinarily resulting from such distinction and achievement [FN 7]. This*

*determination is reached through a qualitative evaluation of the candidate's record of scholarly research or other creative work, teaching, and service [FN 8]. The relative importance of these criteria may vary in different academic units, but each of the criteria must be considered in every decision. Interdisciplinary work, public engagement, international activities and initiatives, attention to questions of diversity, technology transfer, and other special kinds of professional activity by the candidate should be considered when applicable. But the primary emphasis must be on demonstrated scholarly or other creative achievement and on teaching effectiveness, and service alone cannot qualify the candidate for promotion.*

*[FN 7] "Academic achievement" includes teaching as well as scholarly research and other creative work. The definition and relative weight of the factors may vary with the mission of the individual campus. Not being promoted to the rank of professor will not in itself result in special post-tenure review of a tenured associate professor.*

*[FN 8] The persons responsible for this determination are the full professors in the unit who are eligible to vote. The outcome of the vote is either promotion to the rank of professor or continuation in rank as an associate professor. The procedures for voting are identical to those outlined in Section 7.4 for the granting of indefinite tenure, the nondisclosure of grounds for the decision (Section 7.5), and the review of recommendations (Section 7.6). In addition, a petition to the Judicial Committee for review of a recommendation of continuation in rank as an associate professor follows the procedures specified in Section 7.7 for decisions about promotion to associate professor and conferral of indefinite tenure.*

Promotion to Professor is not based on time in rank, but on an increasing record of accomplishments. During the period as an Associate Professor, the candidate will have continued to develop his or her already distinguished record in teaching, research, and service and added substantially to the record that was the basis for the promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. The candidate must have achieved a national and international reputation in her or his area of expertise and be recognized as a leader and a mentor.

The proposal of a candidate for Professor will present evidence of additional significant academic, scientific, scholarly, and professional achievements such as:

1. The establishment of a training program for pre- and/or post-doctoral fellows in a specific discipline.
2. Election to prestigious scientific and/or professional organizations which recognize excellence and significant academic contributions.
3. Letters from authorities attesting to the candidate's acknowledged national or international reputation and recognition of leadership in his/her field; letters from prominent senior faculty members at other universities assessing the candidate's qualifications for promotion to the rank of Professor.
4. Nationally recognized leadership roles in the profession or the institution.
5. Evidence of effective mentoring of junior faculty, fellows, and M.D. and Ph.D. trainees.
6. Creating and sustaining a culture that fosters diversity.
7. Ongoing record of peer-reviewed publications.
8. Ongoing record of funding for research or scholarship (if applicable).
9. Ongoing excellence in clinical activity (if applicable).

## **VI. ANNUAL REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY**

In accordance with Section 7a of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure* and the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty*, each Medical School department will annually conduct a review of each tenured faculty member. The specific

Departmental process for annual review and review criteria (i.e. the goals and expectations for continued performance by tenured faculty) will be described in the Departmental 7.12 Statement Part 2.

The Medical School procedures for annual review of tenured faculty are provided in Part 3 of the document (Annual Review of Tenured Faculty).

#### **VII. VOTING PROCEDURES**

- A. Promotion and tenure decisions in the Medical School require a positive vote by two-thirds of all eligible voting faculty members on the question to recommend affirmatively for promotion and/or tenure.
- B. Decisions to terminate the contract of a probationary faculty member also require a vote by two-thirds of all eligible voting faculty members in support of the motion to terminate the appointment.
- C. Tenured faculty are eligible to vote on the awarding of tenure to probationary faculty. Tenured faculty holding appropriate rank are eligible to vote on recommendations for promotion of candidates.

#### **VIII. PROCESS FOR UPDATING THIS 7.12 STATEMENT**

The Medical School will review its 7.12 Statement Preamble at least every five years, or more frequently as needed. Revisions will be made by the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs. The revisions will be presented to the Faculty Advisory Council. All Medical School tenured and tenure-track faculty will be invited to review and give input on the statement, and approval will be obtained through a majority vote of the tenured and tenure-track faculty, in conjunction with approval of their departmental criteria, with the approval date noted on the document.

#### **History of Revisions (approved by vote of the Faculty):**

*Original Document: Date unknown*

*Revision: April 15, 1993*

*Revision: July 2, 2009*

*Revision Approved by Medical School Faculty: June 21, 2012*

*Approved by Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost: June 22, 2012*



## **PART 2. DEPARTMENTAL ADDENDUM**

### **I. INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT**

This document describes the specific criteria and standards that will be used to evaluate whether probationary faculty in the Department of Microbiology and Immunology meet the general criteria in Section 7.11 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*, as defined for this Department. It also provides the specific criteria and standards that will be used to evaluate associate professors for promotion to professor according to Section 9.2 of the *Faculty Tenure* policy.

This document contains the Department's Criteria and Standards pertaining to:

- A. Awarding of indefinite tenure
- B. Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor and from Associate Professor to Professor
- C. The departmental process for the annual appraisal of probationary and tenured faculty
- D. The goals and expectations for Annual Review of Tenured Faculty

### **II. MISSION STATEMENT**

The mission of the Department of Microbiology and Immunology is to achieve and maintain preeminence in the disciplines of microbiology and immunology through excellence in teaching and research. This mission goes hand-in-hand with the department's long-term goal for all faculty to achieve the rank of full Professor.

To be awarded indefinite tenure, a faculty member will be expected to have demonstrated productivity and distinction in research and effectiveness in teaching in the discipline.

While extraordinary contributions to interdisciplinary work, technology transfer, public engagement and other special kinds of professional activities may be considered when applicable, the primary basis for the award of tenure will be scholarly achievement and effectiveness in teaching and research.

### **III. APPOINTMENT AND ANNUAL APPRAISALS OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY**

#### **A. APPOINTMENT**

Tenured and tenure-track appointments require pre-approval by the Dean of the Medical School to initiate a search. Faculty hired with tenure are subject to approval by the Dean of the Medical School and the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost of the University of Minnesota. Faculty appointed must meet minimum requirements as prescribed by the Department of Microbiology and Immunology and Medical School.

#### **B. ANNUAL APPRAISAL OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY**

##### **1. Process**

The overall process for Annual Review of Probationary Faculty in the Department of Microbiology and Immunology is in compliance with Section 7.2 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure* and the *Procedures for Reviewing Faculty for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty*. The Department Head assigns a Mentoring Committee to each probationary faculty member. The committees are composed of three tenured faculty members. Committees meet with probationary faculty members regularly to promote career development, to monitor their progress and to help new faculty members with tasks such as grant writing, manuscript submission, laboratory management and teaching preparation. Each year, each probationary faculty member, in consultation with his/her Mentoring Committee, prepares an updated curriculum vitae that provides evidence of progress made in the areas of research, teaching and service. The chair of the Mentoring Committee

presents this summary to the tenured faculty members of the Department at a faculty meeting held in the spring of each year. The tenured faculty members monitor the progress of probationary faculty members and provide feedback to the Mentoring Committee and to the probationary faculty member.

The head of the department prepares a written summary of the annual review and discusses the candidate's progress with the candidate, giving a copy of the report to the candidate. This written summary is provided on the University of Minnesota (UM) Form 12 and is signed by the candidate, the head of the department, the Dean of the Medical School, and the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost.

At the end of the fifth probationary year, all probationary faculty must begin the process of review for conferral of indefinite tenure. Probationary faculty who have received approval to extend their maximum period of probationary service for circumstances described in subsection 5.5 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure* can delay this process by one to three years, depending on the approved circumstances.

## 2. Criteria

The criteria for satisfactory performance to be used for the annual review in the Department of Microbiology and Immunology are the same as with the appropriate criteria for rank, as defined in this 7.12 Statement.

## IV. CRITERIA FOR TENURE

### Standards for Tenure - Department of Microbiology and Immunology

In accordance with Section 7.11 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*, the Department of Microbiology and Immunology accepts and subscribes to the criteria and standards for tenure of faculty at the University of Minnesota Medical School, as described in Part 1. Medical School Preamble, with the following standards specific to the department.

Both effectiveness in teaching and professional distinction in research are the bases for tenure decisions; service is also considered. Teaching must reach the level of competence as described in IV.A below and research must reach the level of competence in IV.B. In order to receive tenure, a candidate must also reach either the level of distinction in teaching or distinction in research or both.

### A. TEACHING

While the distribution of faculty effort will reflect relative strengths that may change over a career, faculty members will generally be expected to have primary or shared responsibilities for at least one lecture or lab course per year. Instruction at a minimum should be judged competent.

The following are areas in which competence in teaching can be demonstrated.

1. Participation in teaching and advising graduate and professional students (including students in the M.D. curriculum, pharmacy, dentistry, or other professional education programs) in the subjects of Microbiology and Immunology and allied fields.
2. Service as a thesis adviser to candidates for advanced degrees (master's degree and/or Ph.D.) in the disciplines of Microbiology and Immunology, or in interdisciplinary graduate programs.
3. Service and distinction as a faculty sponsor for a postdoctoral fellow(s) in Microbiology and Immunology or in a collaborative research program.
4. Service as a faculty mentor to students in any of the above categories who engage in research activities in the Department of Microbiology and Immunology.

5. Participation in teaching undergraduate (pre-baccalaureate) students, including students in other colleges of the University of Minnesota.

Competence in teaching is based on:

1. Review of courses taught, directed or developed by the candidate, at both undergraduate and graduate levels.
2. Degree candidates advised in both professional and graduate schools.
3. Evaluations by students.
4. Written statements by the Head of the Department.

Distinction in teaching is based on:

1. The four items given above as sources of evidence for assessment of competence in teaching.
2. Evaluation of publications, such as books, peer-reviewed journal articles, audiovisual aids, and/or other significant contributions to educational advances in the discipline, that are distributed at a national level.
3. Letters from leading educators in the discipline attesting to the candidate's national reputation, and assessing the candidate's contributions to the development of advances in education in the field.
4. Participation in national organizations, such as the American Society for Microbiology, that have significant activities devoted to education and educational development. Evidence of leadership in such an organization (such as by election to an officer position) or recognition by teaching awards from such an organization would be of particular value.

**B. RESEARCH / SCHOLARSHIP**

Microbiology and immunology are research-oriented disciplines and thus tenure recommendations are based on distinction and competence in research judged qualitatively by its originality and impact and by the following specific criteria:

1. Publications in Rigorously Peer-Reviewed Journals

Scientific articles reporting high quality microbiological and immunological research that significantly advances the candidate's field of research should be published in rigorously peer-reviewed journals. Contributions to prestigious review journals, monographs, etc., that are not peer-reviewed will be taken into consideration, but cannot be the primary basis for a decision. Examples of peer-reviewed journals include, but are not limited to:

Journal of Infectious Diseases  
Journal of Virology  
Science  
Infection and Immunity  
Journal of Bacteriology  
Nature  
Journal of Immunology  
Nature Medicine  
Cell  
Molecular Microbiology  
Cellular Microbiology  
Immunity  
Journal of Biochemistry  
Journal of Experimental Medicine  
Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences

Publications in Monographs, Reviews and Other Books

Publications such as these, which are not generally peer-reviewed, should be part of the activities of a faculty member, but cannot be considered as the sole basis for tenure.

Service on a Study Section or as an Editor or as a Member of the Editorial Board of a Reputable Journal or Monograph in a Microbiological or Immunological Discipline

Service such as this usually indicates peer recognition for the candidate's contributions, but cannot be considered as the sole basis for tenure.

Expectations

Generally, faculty members' laboratories are expected to generate an average of 1–3 research papers per year with additional recognition for highly cited articles. Research competence is associated with at least 1 research paper per year in publication venues such as those listed above; research distinction is associated with a greater number of highly cited research papers in such venues.

2. External Research Funding

Expectations

Every faculty member in the Department of Microbiology and Immunology must have an independent research program and must acquire one or more external grants as a principal investigator. The grants must be peer-reviewed and be awarded by federal agencies, international agencies or by nationally competitive private agencies appropriate to the discipline. Demonstrating the ability to obtain and renew external peer-reviewed grants is considered one of the strongest indicators of research distinction. The high likelihood of maintaining such funding throughout a faculty member's career is also deemed to be of the utmost importance and will be used by the department when considering faculty for promotion. The dossier must demonstrate in the judgment of those voting for promotion and tenure that the faculty member is on a trajectory for receiving continued funding and promotion to full professor.

3. Invited Participation in Symposia, Meetings and Seminars

The research of faculty members is expected to be recognized by invitations from other educational institutions and national and international scientific organizations to give seminars and to participate in symposia, meetings and conferences. However, this cannot be used as the sole criterion for tenure.

4. Peer Recognition of Creative and Significant Scholarly Contributions  
Evidence will be sought from peers within the Department of Microbiology and Immunology, the University, and from national and international leaders in the candidate's field of research that the candidate's contributions are scholarly, creative, and have contributed significantly to the advancement of the field. The assessments will also provide clear evidence of whether or not the candidate has the groundwork for a national or international reputation in the disciplines of Microbiology and Immunology.
5. Technology Transfer  
Patented and licensed technologies, and/or founding of start-up biotechnology companies can serve in part as evidence of research leadership and productivity. This activity alone cannot be considered as the sole basis for tenure.

#### C. SERVICE

Faculty members are expected to serve on one or more departmental committees of which search committees and the Committee on Graduate Studies in Microbiology, Immunology, and Cancer Biology are the most important. Professional service is also valued. However, committee and professional service cannot be the sole basis for awarding tenure.

#### D. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

At the end of the fifth year, all probationary faculty will begin the process of review for conferral of indefinite tenure. Probationary faculty who have received approval to extend their maximum period of probationary service for circumstances described in section 5.5 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure* can delay this process by one to three years, depending on the approved circumstances.

### **V. CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR PROMOTION IN FACULTY RANK**

The Department of Microbiology and Immunology accepts and subscribes to the following standards specific to the department:

#### A. ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

Not applicable in the Medical School (entry level rank is Assistant Professor).

#### B. TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

The criteria and standards for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor in the Department of Microbiology and Immunology are those stated for consideration of tenure (see IV above). A recommendation for promotion to Associate Professor is made when an eligible faculty member has fulfilled the general criteria applicable to tenure.

#### C. TO PROFESSOR

The *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty* requires that the tenured faculty of departments review and provide feedback to tenured associate professors every four years regarding their progress toward promotion to the rank of professor. Candidates for promotion to Professor are expected to continue to adhere to the standards on which promotion to Associate Professor was based, with respect to performance and accomplishments in teaching and research. Candidates will also be judged on the following standards:

1. Requirements outlined under section IV. Criteria for Tenure

2. A truly international reputation in research or teaching as shown, for instance, by invitations to international symposia, election to prestigious scientific organizations, holding of offices in international societies and leadership roles.
3. Letters from leading authorities in the candidate's field attesting to the candidate's acknowledged national and international reputation and leadership. Establishment of a training program for pre- and postgraduate trainees that has resulted in placing trainees in academic and industrial positions in their fields.
4. Contributions to mentoring of junior faculty and trainees.
5. Creating and sustaining a culture that fosters diversity.

## VI. ANNUAL REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY

The Department of Microbiology and Immunology utilizes the process for the annual review of tenured faculty defined by Part 3. Annual Review of Tenured Faculty. The faculty member will be reviewed on the basis of the quality of efforts in research, teaching, and service. The review will focus on whether the faculty member has met the goals and expectations for tenured faculty members as outlined in the departmental 7.12 Statement.

The goals and expectations of tenured faculty members in the Department of Microbiology and Immunology are guided by the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*, the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty*, and the mission statements of the Medical School and of the Department of Microbiology and Immunology. Each of these statements emphasizes the triad of Research, Education and Service that comprise the faculty functions. All faculty members are expected to contribute to each of the three elements of the triad, taking into account different stages of faculty development. Furthermore, it is recognized that not all faculty members have equal strengths - strengths in one element of the triad may balance a weakness in another one. Finally, all tenured faculty members are expected to foster the development of Assistant Professors. Full Professors, in addition, are expected to foster the continued development of Associate Professors.

The principal goal of an annual review is to ensure continuation of high caliber performance following the granting of tenure. Thus the aim of the review is pro-active and positive – it seeks to improve faculty members' performance and to identify potential faculty members' weaknesses at an early stage. If weaknesses are apparent, the goal is to develop a plan for limiting these weaknesses to enhance the faculty member's effectiveness towards the Department's mission.

The specific criteria for performance evaluation in the Department include:

### A. TEACHING

1. Outstanding:
  - a. National leadership in shaping the curriculum within a discipline.
  - b. Author or editor of new education media (e.g., textbook, video, computer software) that are distributed nationally.
  - c. Leader in the development of a new program or revitalization of an existing program.
  - d. Principal investigator in the acquisition or renewal of a training grant.
  - e. Receipt of a teaching award.
  - f. Outstanding teaching as defined by course evaluations by students and peers.
  - g. Director of a professional school course, didactic course in a graduate program, or undergraduate course.
2. Satisfactory

- a. Lecturer in one or more courses with satisfactory performance based on course evaluations by students and peers.
  - b. Member of examination committee(s) for graduate students.
  - c. Member of committees that impact education at the University.
3. Unsatisfactory  
Activity does not meet at least one of the above criteria under the satisfactory or outstanding category each year.

**B. RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP**

1. Outstanding
  - a. First or senior author of a research publication in generally acknowledged high-profile journals with high Impact Factors (including, but not limited to, e.g., *Nature*, *Science*, *Cell*, *Nature Medicine*, *JCI*).
  - b. Organize a symposium/workshop that is presented at a prominent national or international meeting.
  - c. Delivery of a plenary talk or named lectureship at a prominent national or international meeting.
  - d. Principal investigator in the acquisition of new research funds that contribute to a program that extends beyond the research of an individual's laboratory (e.g., a program project grant, center grant (local or national, shared instrumentation grant), principal investigator in the renewal of such funds).
  - e. Recipient of multiple NIH grants, MERIT Award, or career development award (e.g. Howard Hughes Investigator or other nationally competitive award).
2. Satisfactory
  - a. Publication in peer-reviewed journals related to microbiology and immunology.
  - b. Principal investigator or co-investigator of a national research grant (NIH/NSF), foundation grants or industry award.
  - c. Organizer of a local symposium, speaker in a national symposium.
3. Unsatisfactory  
Activity does not meet at least one of the above criteria under the satisfactory or outstanding category each year.

**C. SERVICE**

1. Outstanding
  - a. Director of graduate or undergraduate program.
  - b. Acquisition of major funding for an outreach program.
  - c. Chair of major committee (University-wide, Medical School).
  - d. Editor or member of an editorial board of a journal.
  - e. Chair or member of an NIH Study Section or chair of a national committee.
2. Satisfactory
  - a. Member of a major committee (University-wide, Medical School).
  - b. Chair or member of a departmental or graduate program committee.
  - c. Organizer of or contributor to an outreach program.
3. Unsatisfactory  
Activity does not meet at least one of the above criteria under the satisfactory or outstanding category each year.

**VII. VOTING PROCEDURES**

**A. VOTE**

1. A vote will be taken for decisions to continue a probationary appointment or recommend a candidate for promotion and/or tenure. Such a vote will require a 2/3 majority for the motion to pass.
2. A vote will be taken for all decisions to terminate the contract of a probationary faculty member. Such a vote will require a 2/3 majority for the motion to pass.

**VIII. PROCESS FOR UPDATING 7.12 STATEMENT**

The faculty will review and revise these regulations to reflect changes in the discipline as needed and at least every five years.

History:

*Voted on by secret ballot and approved by the Microbiology Faculty, July 17, 2012*

*Approved by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, July 18, 2012*

*Revised to incorporate department name change approved on July 7, 2015*



**PART 3. ANNUAL REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY**

A. ANNUAL REVIEW

All tenured faculty must undergo an annual review each year. This process is key in allowing the faculty member and the department to assess individual progress. It also helps to protect the faculty member, the department, and the School, in case of any misunderstanding or conflict that may arise. For any questions about this process, please call the Office of Faculty Affairs and/or the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs.

1. During the spring of each academic year, all department heads will schedule an annual review conference with each tenured faculty member. This responsibility may be delegated to Division Chiefs, Departmental Review Committee, Center Directors or other designee. All reviews must receive final approval and signature from the Department Head.
2. Prior to this conference the individual faculty member will provide the requisite information, as well as an updated curriculum vitae, following the department's annual review reporting format.
3. Annual reviews may be carried out in the format preferred by each department but must, at a minimum, be compliant with the rules detailed in the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*, Section 7a, and the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty*.
4. The annual review documentation should include:
  - a. Accomplishments of the previous year, particularly in relation to goals set for the year.
  - b. Detailed accomplishments in each domain relevant to the faculty member (as applicable: teaching, research and/or scholarship, service, and clinical activity (if applicable)):
    - i. Evaluation of quality and quantity of teaching, attitude towards learners, knowledge of subject matter, and specific contributions to continuing education.
    - ii. Evaluation of research and/or scholarly activity including current projects, grants applied for or funded, publications, and papers presented or submitted.
    - iii. Evaluation of service.
    - iv. Evaluation of clinical activity (when applicable), including volume of patients served, breadth of referrals, incorporation of patient care into teaching program, activity in local and national professional organizations.
  - c. Percentage of effort in each domain, to be updated annually.
  - d. Agreed upon goals for the upcoming year.
  - e. Plans for subsequent years with specific recognition of outstanding accomplishments and plans to maintain high performance level.

5. The Annual Review conference should emphasize frank discussion concerning the faculty member's past and present performance in given areas of responsibility, noting progress in achieving previously established goals and objectives. In particular, it is important to frame the evaluation in the context of the proposed distribution of responsibilities in the four domains of Teaching, Research/Scholarship, Service, and Clinical Activity (if applicable). If the faculty member is working towards promotion, the Department Head and the faculty member should ensure that year-by-year progress, consistent with the Departmental 7.12 Statement, has been appropriate to date and specific goals for the coming year should be agreed upon.

Pursuant to the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure Track and Tenured Faculty*, each department's tenured faculty shall review their tenured associate professors at a minimum of every four years regarding their progress toward achieving the rank of professor. This review is based upon the criteria for promotion to professor in the department 7.12 statement. This four-year progress review can be part of the annual review process.

6. Following the Annual Review conference, the Department Head or designee will complete the Medical School Annual Review Form, summarizing the conference and stating the agreed upon goals for the upcoming year. The Medical School Annual Review Form must be signed by the faculty member, the evaluator (if applicable), and the Department Head.
7. For faculty members who have met the goals and expectations for tenured faculty for the department, according to the department 7.12 statement, the signed Medical School Annual Review Form is sent to office of Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs who signs on behalf of the Dean. The review form will be handled confidentially by the Dean and the Associate Dean and will assist them in supporting recommendations for promotion, special recognition, or salary adjustments.
8. If the department head or designee finds that the tenured faculty member's performance is below that of the goals and expectations of the department as specified in the 7.12 statement, then the case is referred to a committee of elected, tenured faculty members in the department. If that committee concurs with the judgment of the department head, then both the department head and the committee formulate a detailed written Faculty Improvement Plan for the faculty member. The letter from the department head and the elected committee must identify the ending date for the period of performance improvement and must request that the faculty member provide a report at that time describing his or her progress towards meeting the goals and expectations of the department.

The department head and the committee chair should make reasonable efforts to meet with the faculty member to discuss the plan for meeting the goals and expectations of the unit. The faculty member may request modification of the plan from the department head

and the committee but may not at this stage file a complaint with the Senate Judicial Committee.

At the end of the time period specified for performance improvement, the faculty member under review must provide a report describing his or her progress toward meeting the goals and expectations of the department. The department head and the elected committee of tenured faculty will then review the progress that the faculty member has made regarding the recommendations as specified in the report from the faculty member.

This process above may be repeated for a second year if the faculty member has failed to complete the initial plan.

## **B. SPECIAL PEER REVIEW**

### **1. Initiation**

In compliance with Section 7a.3 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*, a Special Peer Review may be requested by the department head and the departmental review committee of elected, tenured faculty members following the unsuccessful completion of a Faculty Improvement Plan as described in Section A.8 above.

2. The Medical School Dean will be notified and asked to initiate a Special Review. The Dean must first review the file independently to determine that the faculty member falls below the department's goals and expectations and has not successfully completed the Faculty Improvement Plan. S/he determines that special peer review is warranted.

3. The *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty* describe details of the process for the special peer review. Some of these are highlighted below but the reader is referred to the *Procedures* and the *Faculty Tenure* policy for a complete perspective. All of the steps in the *Procedures* and subsection 7a.3 of the *Faculty Tenure* policy must be followed even if they are not described in this document.

### **4. Review Panel**

A Special Review Panel composed of tenured members at the same rank or above the rank of the faculty member under review:

- i. Members are elected independently for each Special Review, by the tenured faculty of the department.
- ii. Members (5) include:
  1. 1 member appointed by the faculty member being reviewed.
  2. 4 members elected from a slate of candidates nominated by department head and the tenured faculty.
- iii. Members may be in the department or outside, if appropriate – case by case. If the faculty member has a secondary appointment in another department, that department should be represented on the committee.
- iv. Members should not be the same as any previous review committee for that faculty member

5. Special Review materials include:
  - a. Department head and previous Review Committee statement(s) requesting Special Review.
  - b. Annual review with goals and effort distribution (at least 5 years if available).
  - c. Previous recommendations for faculty development and outcomes (Performance Improvement Plans).
  - d. Personal statement by the faculty member.
  - e. Current annotated curriculum vitae.
  - f. Teaching evaluations.
  - g. Reprints.
  - h. Supporting documentation, including, but not limited to, letters of acceptance for articles in press, and acknowledgement by journal or funding agency of manuscript or proposal receipt.
  - i. Any other relevant documentation.
  
6. Review Criteria and Methodology
  - a. The main focuses of the Special Review are the area(s) of deficiency identified in previous review(s).
  - b. Due process procedures, as defined in University documents, will be applied to address disagreements at different levels of the review and to offer protection for academic freedom.
  - c. Faculty members undergoing review may examine any material in their file at any time in the review process
  - d. Faculty member's performance will be evaluated as either:
    - i. Satisfactory: meeting department and/or Medical School goals and expectations for tenured faculty members.
    - ii. Unsatisfactory: not meeting department and/or Medical School goals and expectations for tenured faculty members.
  - e. The actions that the Panel may recommend, listed in section 7a.3 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*, include:
    - i. Terminate review if the Panel finds that the faculty member's performance meets the goals and expectations of the department.
    - ii. Alter allocation of effort if the Panel determines that the faculty member's strengths are not being fully utilized: it might suggest that the allocation of effort between teaching, research, and service be altered so as to maximize the faculty member's contributions to the University.
    - iii. Suggested improvements: if the faculty member's performance is likely to be improved by specific steps, and that process can adequately be monitored by further regular Annual Reviews, the Panel may suggest that those steps be taken and remit the case to the Annual Review process.
    - iv. Salary reduction if the faculty member's performance has declined in such a way as no longer to warrant the base salary that is attached to the position, the Panel may recommend a reduction in base salary of up to 10% (see Board of Regents Policy: *Tenure Faculty* for complete details).
    - v. Dismissal: if the faculty member's performance has fallen below the standard of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure* Section 10.21(a),

"sustained refusal or failure to perform reasonably assigned duties adequately," the Panel can recommend the commencement of proceedings for termination of appointment, or involuntary leave of absence (see details below).

- vi. The Panel may also recommend a combination of these measures.
- f. The recommendations of the Panel will be implemented by the Department, the Dean's Office or other administrative body, as appropriate, depending on the specific recommendation.

**History of Revisions (approved by vote of the Faculty):**

*Original Document: Date unknown*

*Approved by Medical School Faculty: June 21, 2012*

*Approved by Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost: June 22, 2012*